

REMARKS

In the Office Action of January 16, 2009, all of the pending claims (36 and 38-52) were rejected under one of 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Comer (US 7,212,300) or under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Comer in view of Chadez et al. (US 6,522,420). Reconsideration and allowance of the claims in light of the remarks herein are respectfully requested.

Claim 36 was rejected as anticipated by Comer. However, the rejection fails to address that the claim recites a substrate having the processor, the system I/O, the formatter controller, and the print server located thereon. For purposes of this Response, Applicant will assume that the Examiner meant to include this limitation of claim 36 in the rejection over Comer. Applicants traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

As stated above, claim 36 recites that the printer formatter has a substrate having the processor, the system I/O, the formatter controller, and the print server located thereon. The print server is claimed to manage a print queue. In rejecting claim 36, the Office Action does not assert that the print server manages a print queue. In fact, Comer does not disclose that the print server (or microprocessor 16) manages any print queue.

Dependent claim 48 recites that the processor is configured to store a print job in a print queue. In rejecting claim 48, the Office Action cites FIG. 4 of Comer and states that “the memory (ROM and RAM) of the processor [is] used to store the instructions required by the processor so it may perform the functions necessary to print images with a printhead.” However, the rejection does not state that Comer discloses that the processor is adapted to store a print job in a print queue. FIG. 4 and the related text of Comer merely describe the traditional components of a printer that receives print jobs from an outside print server that manages the print queue. Neither the cited text, nor FIG. 4, discloses that the microprocessor of Comer stores print jobs in a print queue.

For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 36 and 38-52 be withdrawn.

Amendments

Claims 40-44 and 47-52 have been amended to recite that the respective devices are “configured” as defined in the respective claims, which is consistent with the specification. No new matter has been added.

Conclusion

Therefore, in view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly requested.

If for any reason the Examiner is not able to allow the application, she is requested to contact the Applicant’s undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,

/John R. Lagowski/

John R. Lagowski

Registration No. 41,922

Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200